



AF-  
JPW

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify that this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date set forth below.

RD East  
by Renee D. East  
Date of signature and deposit - July 17, 2006

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Everson et al	)	Group Art Unit: 2136
	)	
Serial No.: 09/664,893	)	Confirmation No.: 5121
	)	
Filed: 9/19/2000	)	Examiner: P. Parthasarathy
	)	
For: Authentication, Application-Authorization,	)	Attorney Docket: 1348(16951)
and User Profiling Using Dynamic	)	
Directory Services	)	

\*\*\*\*\*

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer that was mailed on July 3, 2006. These remarks are directed to the Response to Argument section of the Examiner's Answer.

The statements in the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14 and the succeeding paragraph are confused and incorrect. Moreover, the supposed quote of the claim language is inaccurate and misleading. The Answer associates the recitation of "creating an object associated with the computer user or the Session ID" (which is recited in step f

of claim 1 and the second element of claim 7) with the recitation of “storing at least a portion of the security information in an object” (which is recited in the third step of claim 27). The Answer is misleading because it implies that there are two different objects by putting together limitations from different independent claims. Claims 1 and 7 actually go on to recite “copying at least some of the security information relating to the computer user from the user profile database to the object in the directory” (i.e., the same object). The language quoted from claims 1 and 7 does not appear in claim 27, and the language quoted from claim 27 is the first recitation of “object”.

The Answer tries to equate the session key of Alegre with an object. This attempt fails because in each claim of the present application, the recited object is an entity within a directory wherein the object stores security information. In claims 1 and 7, the object may be associated with the Session ID, but the Session ID is not recited to be the security information stored in the object as the Answer seems to suggest. The defective interpretation of the claims relied on in the Answer undermines the alleged anticipation by Alegre. The rejection suggests that both the session key and cookie in Alegre are objects. Neither one meets the claimed limitation of the object as actually recited.

The comments in the Answer on pages 14-16 concerning the difference between “authenticated and authorized” and “authenticated or authorized” is not germane to applicant’s arguments. What applicant has pointed out is that security information can be used for separate first and second remote applications, a function that Alegre is incapable of.

The other comments in the Answer concerning the teachings and/or motivation to combine Alegre, Hartmant, and Blanco are already addressed in the Brief filed on May 4, 2006.

Accordingly, the final rejection dated January 26, 2006, should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Mark L. Mollon".

Mark L. Mollon  
Registration No. 31,123  
Attorney for Appellant

Date: July 17, 2006  
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC  
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor  
720 Water Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
Tel: 734-542-0228  
Fax: 734-542-9569